

resolution relating to the exclusion of certain aliens; without amendment (Rept. No. 794). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

Mr. CHELF: Committee on the Judiciary. House Joint Resolution 478. Joint resolution relating to permanent residence and deportation of certain aliens; with amendment (Rept. No. 795). Referred to the Committee of the Whole House.

PUBLIC BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 4 of rule XXII, public bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. DULSKI:

H.R. 8557. A bill to provide for the issuance of a national health research stamp for the support of the National Institutes of Health; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

By Mr. KOWALSKI:

H.R. 8558. A bill to amend title 10, United States Code, to provide that enlisted men of the Army, Navy, Marine Corps, or Air Force, who have completed 20 years of service may retire if they served as commissioned officers during World War I and either World War II or the Korean conflict, or during World War II and the Korean conflict; to the Committee on Armed Services.

By Mr. LENNON:

H.R. 8559. A bill to confer jurisdiction on the U.S. District Court for the Eastern District of North Carolina to hear, determine, and render judgment on the claims of the town of Kure Beach, N.C., for damages arising out of the acquisition of certain real property by the United States; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McGOVERN:

H.R. 8560. A bill to amend the Internal Revenue Code of 1954 to extend by 1 additional year the time within which a minister may elect coverage as a self-employed individual for social security purposes; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

H.R. 8561. A bill to assure orderly marketing of an adequate supply of hogs and pork products; to encourage increased domestic consumption of pork and pork products; to maintain the productive capacity of the hog-farming industry; to avoid the feeding of hogs to less desirable weights; and to stop further declines in liveweight prices received

by hog producers; to the Committee on Agriculture.

By Mr. MACDONALD:

H.R. 8562. A bill to repeal section 502(d) and a portion of section 509 of the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, which requires bids by Pacific coast shipbuilders be approved under certain circumstances; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS of South Carolina:

H.R. 8563. A bill to amend the Merchant Marine Act, 1936, in order to eliminate the 6-percent differential applying to certain bids of Pacific coast shipbuilders; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. RIVERS of Alaska:

H.R. 8564. A bill to establish a joint board and to require mandatory through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

H.R. 8565. A bill to establish a joint board and to permit the filing of through routes and joint rates for carriers serving Alaska, Hawaii, and the other States; to the Committee on Interstate and Foreign Commerce.

By Mr. SIKES:

H.R. 8566. A bill to provide for an ad valorem duty on the importation of shrimp; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. THOMSON of Wyoming:

H.R. 8567. A bill to revise the boundaries and change the name of the Fort Laramie National Monument, Wyo., and for other purposes; to the Committee on Interior and Insular Affairs.

By Mr. CHELF:

H.R. 8568. A bill to amend title 7, section 42, of the Canal Zone Code, and for other purposes; to the Committee on Merchant Marine and Fisheries.

By Mr. FOGARTY:

H.J. Res. 488. Joint resolution to help make available to those children in our country who are handicapped by deafness the specially trained teachers of the deaf needed to develop their abilities and to help make available to individuals suffering speech and hearing impairments those specially trained speech pathologists and audiologists needed to help them overcome their handicaps; to the Committee on Education and Labor.

By Mr. OSMERS:

H.J. Res. 489. Joint resolution authorizing and requesting the President to designate a week in August of each year as "National

Food Service Week"; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOSCH:

H. Con. Res. 376. Concurrent resolution that it is the sense of Congress that a sound dollar is the basis for future growth and security of the Nation; to the Committee on Ways and Means.

By Mr. OLIVER:

H. Con. Res. 377. Concurrent resolution providing for certain priorities for the temporary employment of civilian personnel to conduct the decennial census; to the Committee on Post Office and Civil Service.

PRIVATE BILLS AND RESOLUTIONS

Under clause 1 of rule XXII, private bills and resolutions were introduced and severally referred as follows:

By Mr. ADDONIZIO:

H.R. 8569. A bill for the relief of Erika Lysakowski; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BAILEY:

H.R. 8570. A bill for the relief of Madison E. Bailey; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. BOYKIN:

H.R. 8571. A bill for the relief of Jesse W. Clark; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. HEMPHILL:

H.R. 8572. A bill for the relief of Charles John Short; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. McDONOUGH:

H.R. 8573. A bill for the relief of Argyro A. Logothetis; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

By Mr. MILLER of New York:

H.R. 8574. A bill for the relief of Mrs. Varsen Jafarjian; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

PETITIONS, ETC.

Under clause 1 of rule XXII,

249. By Mr. WESTLAND: Petition of members and friends of the Woman's Christian Temperance Union of Ferndale, Wash., petitioning Congress to fight (1) communism, by putting into effect the recommendations made by the American Bar Association, and (2) inflation; to the Committee on the Judiciary.

EXTENSIONS OF REMARKS

White House Conference on Aging

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. FRANK C. OSMERS, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. OSMERS. Mr. Speaker, on September 2 of last year, the President signed into law a White House Conference on Aging Act which had been passed in the closing days of the 85th Congress. In passing this legislation, the Congress felt that public interest required the enactment of legislation to formulate recommendations for immediate action in improving and developing programs to permit the country to take advantage of the experience and skills of the older persons in our population, to create conditions which would better enable them to meet

their needs, and to further research on aging.

Since the enactment of that law, the White House Conference on Aging staff has been appointed and is working with the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare special staff on aging to plan and prepare for the Conference to be held in January 1961.

I am happy to point out that a former colleague of ours, the Honorable Robert W. Kean, of New Jersey, has been named Chairman of the Advisory Committee for the White House Conference on Aging.

In recent weeks the public has become more and more aware of the responsibilities toward our rapidly growing population of older people. Wide press coverage has been given to the recently completed House hearings on the Forand bill, and also to the present hearings in the Senate before the McNamara committee. Life magazine at present is concluding a four-part article dealing with the field of aging.

Last week I had the occasion to read a report to the people from the gentlewoman from New Jersey's Sixth District, Congresswoman FLORENCE P. DWYER, which I feel painted a most complete picture of some of the things which are presently being done in the field of aging and some of the things which are in the planning stage. Certainly, we will all agree that one of our major concerns in the Nation today is the question of how best to meet our responsibilities toward our older people.

Since I feel that Congresswoman DWYER's report was so complete in the field of aging, I would like at this time to insert this report in the RECORD and to commend its reading to my colleagues in the Senate and the House of Representatives.

The report follows:

WHITE HOUSE CONFERENCE ON AGING

(By FLORENCE P. DWYER)

This past week has been a particularly significant one in a field of the highest im-

portance—the question of how best to meet our responsibilities toward our rapidly growing population of older people.

Among the events that made it significant were these: The opening of hearings on the Forand bill, a proposal to include medical and hospital insurance for retired persons through the social security system; reconsideration of the vetoed housing bill with its proposed new program of low-interest loans for housing for the elderly; continued progress in arranging for the huge White House Conference on the Aging scheduled for 1961; and introduction of a bill to liberalize the restrictions on earnings of people receiving social security and for widowed mothers who must work.

Coincidence is not the only explanation for so much attention in one week to the needs of our older people. Consider these facts, for instance. Within 10 years the number of Americans over 65 years old will reach 10 percent of the total population. During that same period of time, the key productive age group—those from 20 to 65 years, from whom almost all the working force is drawn—will be reduced to only one-half our population. This represents an increase for the over-65 group of twice the rate for the population as a whole.

DEPRESSION AND WAR

It is also true that our senior citizens have lower and often declining incomes, with less opportunity than fully employed people to meet the higher costs of the care and services they need. Then, too, our present older generation was severely handicapped in preparing for retirement years by the worst depression and the most expensive war in our history. The collapsed incomes of the 1930's and the debased dollars of wartime and postwar inflation left very little for their futures.

The fact that a minority of our population will shortly be supporting the majority poses several difficult questions:

How can the income produced during their working lives more adequately support the needs of retired persons—the need for housing, medical care, recreation, and living conditions generally, at a level above that of bare subsistence?

How can senior citizens retain the sense of being needed, the feeling of accomplishment and of participation in the life of the community—in other words, how can they be spared the devastating impact of neglect in their advanced years?

What changes should we make in our educational system to prepare younger people for the sometimes unexpected demands of older age?

What practical improvements in our social security, employment, housing, and welfare laws can be made to help relieve old age of insecurity, boredom, neglect, and disillusionment?

CONFERENCE ON AGING

These and related questions will soon receive the most extensive consideration in history, as the planning and organization proceed for the nationwide White House Conference on the Aging. I was reminded of this the other day when I saw an old friend of Union County, former Congressman Robert Kean, of Livingston, here in Washington. Congressman Kean, you may remember, was recently appointed by President Eisenhower as Chairman of the White House Conference. In that capacity, he is a frequent visitor here, meeting with his national committee, establishing State committees, and preparing to mobilize available talents and experience so that the White House Conference in 1961 can offer the Nation an effective program of action.

Meanwhile, Congress has certain immediate responsibilities in this field. One of them is housing for the elderly. While the President unquestionably had good reason to

object to certain provisions in the housing bill he vetoed, there is every reason to hope that any compromise housing bill will include at least the \$50 million program of direct loans for low-rent, specially designed houses for older people. This is a field where private financing has not been able to do the job at rents retired people can afford. Conventional financing of these houses, for example, require monthly rents about \$20 higher than would be true of units built under the proposed new program.

EARNINGS LIMIT UNFAIR

Another immediate obligation of the Congress—and one I consider especially urgent—is to lift the unwise and unfair ceiling on the amount of income which people receiving social security are permitted to earn without forfeiting their social security benefits. The present limit is \$1,200 a year or \$100 a month, completely inadequate for people who cannot live on their social security alone and yet who cannot earn enough more to afford to sacrifice their old-age benefits.

This is a terrible dilemma for older people forced to live on the edge of subsistence. To help remedy it, I introduced a bill last week which would raise the earnings limit to \$2,400, and for widowed mothers of children under 18 to \$3,600 a year.

To my mind, this is simple justice. Since the \$1,200 limit was first imposed, prices have greatly increased and purchasing power, especially for those on fixed incomes, has diminished. Furthermore, this limitation discriminates against those who do not have large savings or extensive investments, since income from these sources is not subject to the limitation. In recent years, too, medical authorities have come to recognize that part-time employment is of positive value for the health and emotional welfare of many older people. The present earnings limit discourages such employment.

CHALLENGE TO DOCTORS

Closely related to this is the question of medical care for the elderly, on which subject the House Ways and Means Committee last week opened public hearings. While there are major objections to the solution proposed by the Forand bill, there is no escaping the fact that a very real and serious problem does exist.

In an extensive study last year, the Department of Health, Education, and Welfare found that older persons have two-and-a-half times as much need for medical and hospital care as have persons under 65, and yet have only 40 percent as much private health insurance to pay for it.

These circumstances, I believe, constitute a tremendous challenge to the medical profession and to all those concerned with preserving the private nature of medical practice in the United States.

These are not isolated matters. They are interrelated and given high priority by the value we place on age. The mature years of our people can enrich and vitalize our whole society—if we take steps now to free our elders and learn to use their judgment, experience and invincible spirit.

Student Loan Program a Success

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JACOB K. JAVITS

OF NEW YORK

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. JAVITS. Mr. President, the 85th Congress enacted, upon the President's

recommendation, the National Defense Education Act wherein provision is made for loans to deserving college and university students. It shows the program to be widely acceptable and utilized. Much has been said as to whether students would seek after and would assume such debts to be repaid after their studies have been completed at a time when they are commencing their careers. The fact that American young men and women are eager in such numbers to undertake these obligations in order to secure an education which might be otherwise unobtainable is an encouraging index of our national vigor. Hon. Arthur S. Flemming, Secretary of Health, Education, and Welfare, made a statement at his news conference on July 28, reporting on the status of the student loan program under the National Defense Education Act:

I ask unanimous consent to have this statement printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the statement was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

STATEMENT BY ARTHUR S. FLEMMING, SECRETARY OF HEALTH, EDUCATION, AND WELFARE

On the basis of a preliminary review of loan fund applications made to the Office of Education, colleges and universities across the country expect nearly 121,000 students to apply for loans under the National Defense Education Act during the 1959-60 school year.

These students represent about 5.5 percent of the total anticipated full-time enrollment of approximately 2,200,000 at the participating institutions, and they are expected to apply—on the average—for loans of about \$500 to help them continue their education during the forthcoming school year.

The estimated number of student borrowers and the amounts they are expected to apply for are taken from loan fund applications received by the Office of Education from 1,372 colleges and universities planning to participate in the student loan program this year.

This will be the first full year of operation for the student loan program, since the bulk of the money appropriated for the 1958-59 fiscal year was not available until last May 20.

Institutions applying for loan funds this year—180 more than participated last year and representing nearly 88 percent of the total full-time college enrollment in this country—have estimated that their student loan needs during 1959-60 will total about \$60.5 million.

These institutions have on hand about \$15 million from the \$30.5 million distributed last year, thus leaving an additional requirement of about \$45.5 million this year. The institutions are required to contribute one-tenth of their total student loan funds under the National Defense Education Act.

Thus, of the \$45.5 million estimated to be needed this year, the institutions would be required to contribute \$4.5 million. This would leave \$41 million to be provided by the Federal Government.

The pending appropriation for student loans this year is \$30 million, thus leaving a possible deficit of \$11 million.

In this connection, however, it should be borne in mind that the applications have not yet been reviewed for reasonableness. Also, our experience so far would indicate that the actual need for loans will be less than the estimated demands. Taking these two factors into consideration, I am confident that the pending appropriation will meet, or come close to meeting, the actual needs of students for the coming academic year.

It is too early to say, of course, with any certainty what the actual situation will be. We will have a much clearer picture by the latter part of this year. If, during the course of the first semester, the Federal appropriation turns out to be inadequate we will consider submitting a request for a supplemental appropriation at the beginning of the next session of Congress.

I should like to call particular attention to a new procedure which has been worked out for reviewing applications from individual institutions which is designed to improve distribution of funds within the State.

Funds are allotted among the States on the basis of their share of the total college enrollment and proportionately within each State on the basis of the amounts requested by the individual institutions.

Under the new procedure developed by the Office of Education with the assistance of leaders in higher education, an amount equal to \$20 for each full-time student enrolled has been adopted as a guide for determining the reasonableness of applications.

Institutions requesting more than \$20 per full-time student enrolled have been required to submit detailed justifications. These justifications will be examined critically by a recently appointed panel of college administrators.

Applications for student loan funds for 1959-60 under the National Defense Education Act

State or Territory	Number of institutions participating	Full-time enrollment	Estimated number of borrowers	Estimated average loan	Funds now on hand	Federal funds requested	State allotments
Total.....	1,372	2,195,173	120,644	\$501.22	\$15,064,706	\$41,127,586	\$30,000,000
Alabama.....	24	35,569	5,409	216.24	207,382	851,095	429,412
Arizona.....	7	22,885	926	611.12	110,721	409,661	240,687
Arkansas.....	18	22,195	1,050	455.11	59,908	378,330	252,747
California.....	95	191,906	7,109	550.51	1,419,353	2,380,451	2,871,350
Colorado.....	18	32,251	1,144	620.60	173,877	482,872	406,661
Connecticut.....	18	29,053	1,577	417.39	290,013	356,724	404,077
Delaware.....	3	3,375	196	274.49	22,921	26,965	51,988
Florida.....	19	42,451	2,979	433.65	110,545	1,056,156	540,475
Georgia.....	34	39,569	1,816	507.33	182,132	665,224	456,743
Idaho.....	7	13,126	422	697.70	143,521	137,829	117,876
Illinois.....	58	105,795	5,782	531.07	737,791	2,094,725	1,501,629
Indiana.....	28	67,239	3,697	475.66	281,932	1,328,912	842,286
Iowa.....	41	44,079	2,130	539.49	278,276	785,453	575,064
Kansas.....	33	36,771	2,442	529.47	147,912	1,034,310	501,474
Kentucky.....	26	29,915	2,112	451.70	88,052	779,811	403,894
Louisiana.....	15	44,639	2,251	573.52	272,229	916,891	538,582
Maine.....	12	9,293	531	461.51	36,655	157,566	123,763
Maryland.....	20	26,307	1,258	561.05	130,765	517,091	392,747
Massachusetts.....	61	81,881	4,674	557.05	861,183	1,574,197	1,223,665
Michigan.....	41	102,488	3,701	649.07	575,138	1,628,783	1,332,763
Minnesota.....	31	56,800	4,047	444.10	210,232	1,415,368	678,452
Mississippi.....	30	26,622	1,853	397.36	98,646	578,980	329,300
Missouri.....	40	54,753	4,225	550.83	216,716	1,904,623	725,715
Montana.....	9	10,744	378	670.64	79,297	157,664	123,215
Nebraska.....	19	22,568	1,028	559.39	206,061	332,098	284,836
Nevada.....	1	2,277	50	700.00	22,100	11,610	25,269
New Hampshire.....	7	9,300	957	\$312.46	\$79,209	\$197,829	\$115,631
New Jersey.....	23	35,538	1,342	612.51	218,532	543,327	564,178
New Mexico.....	9	10,858	903	404.80	22,526	308,704	138,617
New York.....	99	185,503	11,772	531.73	2,081,361	3,782,085	2,954,351
North Carolina.....	50	56,089	3,672	419.07	294,991	1,146,163	701,646
North Dakota.....	11	13,012	699	542.51	97,147	254,565	138,199
Ohio.....	57	106,803	5,531	508.16	676,065	1,911,494	1,404,049
Oklahoma.....	29	46,655	3,043	485.36	231,538	1,122,873	558,317
Oregon.....	18	28,613	907	647.15	238,152	313,719	362,596
Pennsylvania.....	80	117,558	7,000	502.47	841,587	2,437,751	1,757,848
Rhode Island.....	9	13,053	943	439.05	109,551	274,028	156,355
South Carolina.....	26	21,933	1,396	443.05	155,989	416,819	330,435
South Dakota.....	14	12,941	808	427.37	42,020	277,181	159,670
Tennessee.....	41	48,144	3,157	432.30	296,393	944,030	580,598
Texas.....	62	112,783	5,329	546.86	1,080,163	1,647,736	1,677,719
Utah.....	9	16,883	563	641.66	124,793	212,817	315,516
Vermont.....	13	8,361	905	313.38	85,243	178,528	96,523
Virginia.....	20	32,530	1,848	487.05	305,629	534,994	472,968
Washington.....	19	44,040	1,602	545.66	306,462	581,307	544,351
West Virginia.....	18	21,789	1,089	477.54	66,420	423,162	267,783
Wisconsin.....	30	54,535	2,067	605.12	435,554	715,782	685,866
Wyoming.....	3	4,850	280	382.86	5,657	91,389	55,368
Alaska.....	1	700	30	500.00	7,583	6,675	3,433
District of Columbia.....	10	17,901	979	685.65	148,948	470,674	322,264
Hawaii.....	3	5,615	65	940.95	55,326	5,252	77,949
Puerto Rico.....	3	16,435	960	485.42	94,509	394,343	180,045
Guam.....							1,188
Canal Zone.....							1,827

Source: Department of Health, Education, and Welfare, Office of Education, July 1959.

Senator Kennedy Declares Passage of Landrum-Griffin Bill Would Jeopardize Enactment of Labor Reform Law and Urges Passage of Elliott Bill

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. JOHN BRADEMAs

OF INDIANA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. BRADEMAs. Mr. Speaker, I should like to insert in the CONGRESSIONAL RECORD the text of the comment of the distinguished Senator from Massachusetts, the Honorable JOHN F. KENNEDY, concerning President Eisenhower's television speech of August 6, 1959, on labor reform legislation.

Senator KENNEDY, as we all know, by his diligent work on the McClellan committee and in guiding a labor-management reform bill through the Senate, speaks with knowledge and authority in this field.

Senator KENNEDY's statement follows:

The President is wholly misinformed about the contents of the bill which passed the Senate by a 90-to-1 vote and about the House committee bill. Both of these measures would eliminate racketeering and the abuses disclosed by the McClellan committee in trade unions but, unlike the Griffin-Landrum bill, would not wreck the legitimate union movement. Passage of the Griffin-Landrum bill by the House would definitely jeopardize enactment of labor reform legislation at this session of Congress.

Mr. Speaker, in a filmed interview this week, Senator KENNEDY told me he supported the bill reported by the House Education and Labor Committee and introduced by the distinguished gentleman from Alabama [Mr. ELLIOTT]. Said Senator KENNEDY:

I hope that the Elliott bill will be accepted. I think we can get quick agreement between the Senate and the House on such legislation and go home feeling that we've done an important job in protecting union funds and the democratic rights of all union members.

The Senator went on to say that the bill sponsored by the gentleman from Georgia [Mr. LANDRUM] and the gentleman from Michigan [Mr. GRIFFITH] "would not concentrate, as the Elliott bill does, on the shortcomings of a few racketeers and hoodlums but is instead an effort to limit the legitimate rights of all unions to bargain for their members."

Mr. Speaker, I should like also to insert in the RECORD the text of Senator KENNEDY's statement of August 3, 1959, concerning the need for labor reform legislation.

The statement follows:

This Congress must pass a labor-management reform bill. We cannot go home without enacting a responsible, effective measure that will strike hard at racketeers without penalizing honest union members—a bill that will carry out all the recommendations of the McClellan committee.

The Griffin-Landrum bill now offered as a substitute for the Elliott bill is not such

a measure, and its adoption would endanger final passage of any reform legislation by complicating the chances for a conciliation of the Senate and House version.

The Griffin-Landrum bill seeks to undo the conscientious efforts of the House committee members by substituting a punitive measure—restricting the rights of all honest union members—for a responsible measure aimed at the Hoffas, the Dios, and the Sheffermans, based on the McClellan committee reports and compatible with the strong, workable bill which passed the Senate 90 to 1.

The hodgepodge substitute bill, on the other hand, goes far beyond the recommendations of the McClellan committee—threatening to restrict the antiracketeering efforts of honest unions, to bog down small unions, and the bill's administration in a welter of redtape, and to weaken labor's legitimate rights at the bargaining table. Far more than that, it strengthens the grip of racketeers. I am hopeful that it will be promptly rejected by all those truly interested in passing a strong antiracketeering bill during this session of Congress.

Results of Poll

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PETER FRELINGHUYSEN, JR.

OF NEW JERSEY

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. FRELINGHUYSEN. Mr. Speaker, under leave to extend my remarks I should like to include a tabulation of responses totaling over 7,000, to my questionnaire recently mailed to some 35,000 constituents in my congressional district, seeking their views on current political issues.

I should particularly like to call attention to the fact that an overwhelming majority of those replying feel that legislation should be enacted in the labor field, and that to be effective, provisions should be included to restrict secondary boycotts and blackmail picketing.

With respect to choices for presidential candidates, this poll indicates a strong preference for Vice President Nixon over Governor Rockefeller and on the Democratic side, a slight lead for Senator KENNEDY over Adlai Stevenson. The tabulation was made prior to the Vice President's recent trip to the Soviet Union and Poland:

TABULATED RESPONSES TO 1959 QUESTIONNAIRE
MAILED BY CONGRESSMAN FRELINGHUYSEN

1. On the subject of a balanced budget do you favor:

(a) Curtailing our domestic programs, if necessary, to balance the budget? Yes, 68.4 percent. No, 19.6 percent. No opinion, 12 percent.

(b) Cutting defense spending, if necessary, to balance the budget? Yes, 24.4 percent. No, 58.4 percent. No opinion, 17.2 percent.

(c) Balancing the budget regardless of defense or domestic considerations? Yes, 25.4 percent. No, 47.9 percent. No opinion, 26.7 percent.

2. On the subject of labor legislation do you believe:

(a) Legislation is needed to curb abuses by certain labor unions? Yes, 94.7 percent. No, 2.2 percent. No opinion, 3.1 percent.

(b) If labor reform legislation is enacted, should provisions be included to restrict secondary boycotts and "blackmail" picketing? Yes, 88.4 percent. No, 4.5 percent. No opinion, 7.1 percent.

3. Which form of Federal aid to education, if any, do you favor?

(a) Aid in school construction programs to needy areas? Yes, 57.5 percent. No, 19.9 percent. No opinion, 22.6 percent.

(b) Aid for teachers' salaries as well as school construction? Yes, 32.3 percent. No, 44.2 percent. No opinion, 23.5 percent.

(c) No Federal aid? Yes, 28.2 percent. No, 32.2 percent. No opinion, 39.6 percent.

4. In our foreign aid program would you favor a shift in emphasis from military assistance to economic aid? Yes, 48.8 percent. No, 30.8 percent. No opinion, 20.4 percent.

5. On the subject of farm subsidies:

(a) Should we reduce Government price supports and attempt to return to a free market system? Yes, 84.3 percent. No, 6.1 percent. No opinion, 9.6 percent.

(b) Should we cut off all farm subsidies? Yes, 47.6 percent. No, 30.6 percent. No opinion, 21.8 percent.

6. (a) Whom would you prefer as the Republican presidential candidate in 1960?

Name:	Percent
Nixon.....	55.4
Rockefeller.....	24.4
No opinion.....	20.2

(b) Whom would you prefer as the Democratic candidate?

Name	Percent
Kennedy.....	21.6
Stevenson.....	17.1
Johnson.....	8.1
Symington.....	7.9
Humphrey.....	4.5
Kefauver.....	3.8
No opinion.....	36.4

What REA Means to America

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. ROBERT W. LEVERING

OF OHIO

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. LEVERING. Mr. Speaker, last Friday night it was my pleasure to speak to more than 800 customers of the Tuscarawas-Coshocton Electric Cooperative, Inc., at the fairgrounds in Coshocton, Ohio, in my congressional district. I talked on the subject of "What REA Means to America" and pointed out that since the Rural Electrification Administration was established, 95 percent of the farms in America have been electrified, which all demonstrates how free enterprise and Government can work together for progress.

Mr. Speaker, under unanimous consent, I include the remarks which I made on this occasion in the RECORD.

WHAT REA MEANS TO AMERICA

Mr. Manning, Reverend Wells, Mayor Leach, President Darling, other distinguished officers of Tuscarawas-Coshocton Electric Co-op, ladies and gentlemen, I am honored to have this opportunity to be with you this evening and to think with you on an important agency of our Federal Government. It is my earnest, honest hope, in speaking to you, that something I might say, some thought

I might express, will stimulate in you the desire to help me, and others in our Government, to do our jobs a little better, a little more efficiently, a little more energetically, so that all of us can make more progress. As you know I am a co-op user myself. Our home and farm in Knox County is served by the Morrow Rural Electric Cooperative.

We live, as we all know, in a challenging period in world history. While every generation has produced its own problems, and they have been many, I feel sure that, no matter what former period of human history you could choose, you would encounter no more churning, no more explosive situations, than we know exist in our world today.

At home, and abroad, we, as a free people, face problems of great magnitude. Tom Paine wrote, during the American Revolution: "These are the times that try men's souls. * * * You and I, as we become aware of all the potential peril points on this old globe, can repeat those words and put an exclamation point after them."

And yet, as Emerson once remarked: "The years teach much that the days never know."

As we get a little older, and a little more experienced, we can look back and see that progress is being made, in this or that field of endeavor. Let us realize that there is nothing automatic about progress, however. All of human history—all of life—all the recorded teachings of mankind—teach us that every step of progress that has been made has been one long and constant battle. Men who wanted to progress, individually or in groups, have found that they must battle against inertia, greed, stupidity, human cruelty, as well as against all the forces of nature, from decay and depreciation to the onslaughts of the elements.

Let us bear in mind that all progress is an uphill fight, not only against people who do not want to move, but against all the impediments placed in our paths by life and nature.

William James said, and I quote: "If this life be not a real fight, in which something is eternally gained for the universe by success, it is no better than a game of private theatricals from which one may withdraw at will. But it feels like a real fight."

You who have been active in the REA movement know, from the history of the agency, that rural electrification has been a real fight, all during its history, and even before the Rural Electrification Administration was born. I did not know the men, but I knew of them, who had a hand in opening up rural America to electricity, and I should like to pay tribute to them. Foremost among them was Senator George W. Norris, the Independent of Nebraska, who for 25 years reigned supreme in the Senate as the man who thought the most about the future of his country. Among those early fighters there was a Congressman named John E. Rankin, of Tupelo, Miss., who no longer sits in the House of Representatives but still is remembered by the oldtimers there. John Rankin will always be numbered among the founders of the REA. And then there was Judson King, who died only a few months ago in his home outside of Washington. Judson King was a public relations man for the people. For most of his life, he battled, through his writings, for projects that would benefit all the people of this country, as opposed to ideas and ideals that were designed to help the few at the expense of the many. And, I am happy to report, my father-in-law, Representative Usher L. Burdick, was in that valiant and limited group that originally fought the battles for rural electrification. I'm also happy to report that Usher Burdick, although he retired

from Congress at the end of the 85th Congress, still is alive and happy and as ram-bunctious as ever. While, as I noted, I did not know many of these men personally, I know them by reputation, and I am sure that there is tonight, among us, several individuals who may have known one or the other of them. It behooves us, I believe, to remember these stalwarts of other days, for we can gather strength from their struggles and their victories for the battles that may lie ahead.

These men lived, as we do, in a period of great change. But they never allowed the distractions, and the deliberate tactics of their enemies to divert them from the paths they knew they must take. We, too, must learn not to be diverted from our legitimate aspirations by the little, petty, picaresque things of life. We must keep our minds and our hearts on the larger goals, and push on, regardless of the disruptions which constantly will be placed in our paths.

The Rural Electrification Administration program demonstrates, I think, how free enterprise and a sympathetic government can work together to solve a vexing and difficult problem for human beings.

In 1935, before the REA came into being, only 1 farm in every 10 in the United States had electricity. For all practical purposes, rural America was in the dark. Of course, there were kerosene lamps, there were hand-operated waterpumps, and there were Chic Sales outhouses behind every farmhouse. If you drove into the countryside after dark, in those days, the only possible lights you would see, besides the headlights of your own automobile, would be the dim and flickering lamps that would be burning in one or two rooms of the farmhouses.

Today, due principally to the foresight of the men who worked for the REA to become enacted into law, 95 percent of all farms in the United States have central station electric service. In less than 25 years, we have seen electricity transform the rural home into a modern, convenient place to live.

As we know, the REA made it possible for groups of local farms and other individuals to organize into cooperatives and to borrow long-term loans at low interest for the purpose of generating and distributing electricity, as well as building and operating rural telephone companies. In the past 23 years, some 1,000 of these REA cooperatives—completely owned and operated by local people in as many communities—have borrowed and used about \$3 billion from the Federal Government to build modern electric power systems to serve rural areas.

I doubt seriously if \$3 billion of Federal funds ever has been used more economically or with more lasting benefit to the comfort and welfare of as many people in the whole history of Government anywhere on earth. There is no telling how many elderly people have been able to turn on the water spout in subzero weather, instead of having to walk out into bitter cold to get water from the well. There is no computing how many women with child, alone and unattended on isolated farms, have been able to do their necessary household chores, more or less in the comfort of their homes, without having to strain themselves by pumping water outside, or injure themselves by other manual labor they might have had to do if they had not had electricity.

If there were any way that we, tonight, could look into the hundreds of thousands of homes that have been served through the years by electric power, made available because of the REA program, I am sure that we would see a story that would make all the miracles of ancient writ pale into insignificance. Electricity, we know, is a miracle in and of itself. The fact that, in the mid-thirties, our leaders of those days could be farsighted enough to see the challenge and to meet the challenge and make Federal

money available to local groups, represents another miracle. And every home that has enjoyed a transformation as a result of the electricity represents another miracle.

These rural electrification systems today are operating in 47 States and in Puerto Rico. They have brought electricity to more than half of all the electrified farms of America, and because they have made this great service possible to half the homes, they have provided the competitive stimulus necessary to obtain service for most of the other homes of the country.

Back in 1935, when the REA experiment was just beginning, it was argued that all farmers who wanted electricity had it and that there was no market for power out in the country. Experience in the last 23 years has demonstrated how wrong this contention was. Rural people are using electricity at an ever-increasing rate, doubling their use of power every 5 to 7 years.

The success of the rural electrification program has been so overwhelming that many opponents no longer try to attack it openly. Instead, they are coming forth with proposals to improve the program. The President's budget message, with its proposals for REA, illustrates this point.

For 2 years in a row the administration has asked Congress to jack up the REA interest rate. This is being done despite the fact that all evidence indicates that such an increase would necessitate higher electric bills for all the consumers served and many co-ops, especially those in the thinner territories, would be driven out of business. As you know, REA is prohibited by law from serving towns with a population of more than 1,500, which means that it is barred from participating in the cream of the electric industry market.

For 2 years in a row the administration has also asked Congress to change the REA Act so as to permit the Secretary of Agriculture to turn a part of the loan business over to the Wall Street bankers. This proposal was so drastic that in the last session of Congress not a single Member was willing to put his name to the bill and sponsor its introduction.

In the budget message the President also asked for a tax on co-ops and he recommended a slowdown for the Federal power program upon which nearly half of the co-ops depend for their wholesale power.

The President is not the only member of the administration who has been harassing REA. The Secretary of Agriculture has extended his domination over the REA Administrator and drastically clipped his authority. All new loans, and all major loans, as a result of the Secretary's directive, must now be cleared with his office before they can be approved.

During this session of Congress a drive has been made to end the Secretary's domination and to restore to the Administrator the loanmaking authority that Congress gave him originally. Committees in both the House and the Senate gave prompt consideration to the bill, which was known as the Humphrey-Price bill, and by April both Houses had taken action, voting overwhelmingly for the measure which had been vigorously supported by rural electric systems in all parts of the country.

First the Senate, and then the House, gave their approval. However, when the bill reached the President's desk, he vetoed it. The Senate promptly overrode his veto, with several votes to spare. The scene changed to the House; and in the last hours before the rollover the administration decided to make the Humphrey-Price bill a straight party-line issue. The President called upon all the Representatives who had voted for the bill in the earlier vote. He succeeded in getting enough of them to switch that on the final rollover the veto was sustained by a slim four-vote margin. The House, in the

biggest turnout for any rollover in history, fell just four votes short of the two-thirds majority needed to make the bill a law.

The rural electric systems were defeated in their efforts to reestablish the authority and prestige of the REA Administrator; but it is to be hoped that the overwhelming vote will prevent the Secretary of Agriculture from interfering with the loan procedure in the future.

Another vital issue developed last summer, when the Comptroller General issued a ruling that if allowed to stand will seriously damage the REA program. The Comptroller General, Mr. Joseph Campbell, who served on the Atomic Energy Commission at the time of the Dixon-Yates scandal, and who was appointed Comptroller by President Eisenhower on December 15, 1954, in his ruling ordered an unprecedented restriction on the REA Administrator's loanmaking authority. This ruling completely reversed congressional intent as set forth in the REA Act and completely ignored 23 years of successful administration.

The Comptroller has still not reversed his ruling, although he has said he did not intend to enforce it. There are bills in Congress to investigate this damaging and disruptive procedure.

The big challenge of the future in the REA program is to complete the extension of service to the remaining 2 million rural residents, and to provide the necessary power capacity to service constantly growing needs.

The use of electricity from REA-financed lines increased from a monthly average of 134 kilowatt-hours per farm in 1949 to about 291 kilowatt-hours in 1957. Farmers are coming to depend more and more upon electricity as a production tool. About 400 farm uses for electricity are known; at least 250 of them increase production or make farming more profitable.

Farmers already use more electric energy for more farm tasks than was expected when the original lines were built. As a result, power distributors are faced with the necessity of heavyening up the lines and substations to keep abreast of demand. A program of system improvements has been a major activity of most REA electrification borrowers in recent years.

An important result of the expanding rural electrification program is the increased business it brings into rural communities. It stimulates private business, both locally and nationally. I confirm what Mr. Erman said. Surveys indicate that for every dollar invested in rural power facilities, the farmer invests \$3 to \$4 in wiring, plumbing, and electrical appliances. Also, when power is available, the establishment of industry in rural areas is encouraged.

It has been a great pleasure for me to be with you this evening, and to think with you on this important subject. As you all know, I am pledged to work for the REA in every good way, consistent with the finest democratic principles of our country.

Richard Nixon, Statesman

EXTENSION OF REMARKS

OF

HON. PAUL B. DAGUE

OF PENNSYLVANIA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. DAGUE. Mr. Speaker, no one—not even the most rabid partisan—could have experienced anything but swelling pride as the Vice President and his charming helpmate came down the ramp at National Airport yesterday afternoon.

Here were two returning Americans who a few days previously had sallied forth to meet on his own heath the man who has threatened to bury us. Here were two plain Americans with as humble backgrounds as any among us and yet who by the very persuasiveness of their charm had melted the hostility of people behind the Iron Curtain and perhaps in 10 short days had contributed more to the cause of peace than has any other person in the last decade.

Over the past several years we have seen many Western diplomats, including some of our own legislators, try to beard the Russian bear in his den and in nearly every case they have come slinking home to tell us the Communists are 10 feet tall and invincible. Well, Dick Nixon in a few short hours dispelled that myth and standing toe to toe with Mr. K. handed him back better than he gave. As a matter of fact, I surmise that by talking up to the Soviet boss and showing him that Americans have the courage of their convictions, and that bluster and bluff are not potent tools with which to turn aside truth and logic, Mr. Nixon has caused Mr. K. to reevaluate his previous estimates of just how far he can go before running up against the solid wall of American determination.

In his televised address to the Russian people the Vice President laid it on the line and firmly but without rancor reaffirmed the basic desire of all the West; namely, that we have no aggressive designs on anybody and that all we want is to live at peace with all nations and races. A much-admired columnist, Mr. Gould Lincoln had this comment in Wednesday's Evening Star:

Mr. Nixon's address to the Russians included a frank invitation to the Russian Communists to lay aside their announced program of world communism and world domination, the ultimate result of that program. He told the people quite flatly that as long as their leaders persist in their drive for communizing the world, including the United States, they must expect the United States and its allies of the free world to maintain their military bases within easy striking distance of the U.S.S.R. Further, he said that this country will continue to increase its military strength. Mr. Nixon's whole tone was firm, but distinctly he engaged in no saber rattling. His warm appreciation of the Russian people and their hospitality to himself and Mrs. Nixon was a strong overlying theme.

And then Mr. Lincoln sums up in these words:

Mr. Nixon has again shown himself a master at grasping the essentials of the most vital problems which confront the United States, the U.S.S.R. and the whole world. His whole bearing during his momentous visit to Russia at a tense moment, with the East and West in virtual deadlock over the problems of West Berlin and all of Germany, was a credit to himself and to his country. Whether he was engaged in rough-and-tumble debate with Russia's Khrushchev, or whether he was being heckled by persons in the throngs which greeted him, Mr. Nixon never lost his dignity and he was never at a loss in meeting the situations as they developed.

Mr. Speaker, the American people have the right to be proud of this great American and we should humbly thank an all-wise Creator for having blessed

our side in this cold war with this ablest champion of the course of freedom. Indeed, we might well echo the warm-hearted cheers of the Polish people as they pelted him with flowers and shouted, "Thank you, thank you, thank you, Mr. NEEKSON."

Closing of Geneva Conference

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. ALEXANDER WILEY

OF WISCONSIN

IN THE SENATE OF THE UNITED STATES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. WILEY. Mr. President, yesterday we witnessed the closing of the Big Four Foreign Ministers Conference at Geneva. Unfortunately, the Conference did not yield any substantial progress toward resolving East-West differences.

The significance of the Geneva meeting, however, should not go unnoticed.

During the 65-day Conference—broken by an interim recess—Secretary of State Christian Herter, his associates, and representatives of our allies, carried out their duties in a dedicated manner—under extremely difficult circumstances.

We recognize, however, that success in such a conference depends upon readiness to obtain agreement by both the participating parties. Unfortunately, the Soviet delegation—under direction from Moscow—of course were unwilling to engage in the kind of negotiations which would result in resolution of problems. However, this should not unfairly reflect on the statesmanlike work of our representatives at the Geneva meetings.

Rather, it again reveals the adamancy of the Soviet delegates against any kind of agreement that would do other than serve their own aims of Communist expansionism.

In wrapping up the Conference, however, the door has been left open—as I believe it should be—for further sessions if deemed advisable. As often noted, it is better to be exchanging words than bombs. As yet, no date for reconvening has been agreed upon.

I ask unanimous consent to have the Big Four communique published in today's Washington Post and Times Herald printed in the RECORD.

There being no objection, the article was ordered to be printed in the RECORD, as follows:

FOREIGN MINISTERS' TALKS COMMUNIQUE

GENEVA, August 5.—Text of the concluding communique of the Big Four Conference:

"Communique of the Geneva Conference of Foreign Ministers, 1959.

"The Conference of Foreign Ministers met in Geneva from May 11 to June 20 and from July 13 to August 5, 1959.

"The Conference considered questions relating to Germany, including a peace treaty with Germany and the question of Berlin.

"The positions of the participants in the Conference were set out on these questions. "A frank and comprehensive discussion took place on the Berlin question.

"The positions of both sides on certain points became closer.

"The discussions which have taken place will be useful for the further negotiations which are necessary in order to reach an agreement.

"Furthermore, the Conference provided the opportunity for useful exchanges of views on other questions of mutual interest.

"The Foreign Ministers have agreed to report the results of the Conference to their respective governments.

"The date and place for the resumption of the work of the Conference will be settled through diplomatic channels."

The Great White Fleet: A Mission for Humanity

EXTENSION OF REMARKS OF

HON. GEORGE S. McGOVERN

OF SOUTH DAKOTA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Thursday, August 6, 1959

Mr. McGOVERN. Mr. Speaker, as one of the sponsors of a concurrent resolution calling for the use of some of America's idle warships in a worldwide mission to transport surplus food, medical assistance, and technical aid to distressed peoples, I am deeply moved by the manner in which the American people have opened their hearts and minds to this proposal. My own South Dakota constituents who have written to me on this theme have endorsed the Great White Fleet idea without exception.

The deep humanitarianism of the American people and their basic religious faith in the brotherhood of man shines through the letters coming to me and to other sponsors of the mercy fleet proposal.

I am grateful to Commander Manson of the U.S. Navy who conceived of the idea, and to Life magazine for so effectively publicizing it.

Here is an idea in which all Americans can share by modest voluntary contributions. It will dramatize America's material and spiritual strength for all the world to see. It will give us a powerful instrument in the competition with communism for the uncommitted masses of the globe. Most of all, it will be good for the soul of America to thus heed the admonition of the Great Teacher that we feed the hungry, clothe the naked, and minister to the afflicted.

The Navy has many ships lying idle in American harbors—including four completely equipped hospital ships. We have other ships filled to overflowing with surplus farm commodities that are beginning to deteriorate. We have a host of the world's finest doctors, nurses, and technicians. We have millions of citizens who would contribute dimes, quarters, and dollars to finance the staffing and supplying of the mercy fleet.

Why should we delay in activating a small portion of our mothball fleet and devote it not to the science of killing, but to the science of healing? This idea may well be grabbed up and put into operation by the Soviet Government if we do not hasten to implement it.

The finest minds in the United States have deplored the unfortunate tendency

of American foreign policy to react in a negative way to Soviet moves. There is a widely felt need for a more positive, imaginative U.S. foreign policy that would give America the initiative. We desperately need to hold up to the world the image of an America that has a positive faith and a constructive foreign policy of its own.

Who can cite a more effective device to dramatize to disaster and distressed sectors of the globe that America is concerned about all of God's creatures?

Listen to some of the letters I have received in reply to my White Fleet newsletter of July 25 which I will ask to have printed at the close of my remarks today.

A successful insurance man, who is a long-time fellow townsman and friend of mine, M. A. Hoellwarth of Mitchell, S. Dak. writes:

The Great White Fleet is the most important idea that has come across the brain of Christian man in a long while. Let's do it, as it is an opportunity to show the people in our world that Americans are unselfish and love their fellow man wherever he may be. One hundred percent endorsement.

A banker from Huron, S. Dak., Mr. Arlo Swanson, said:

I just finished reading your Washington report of July 25 in connection with the Great White Fleet for promoting peace and better relations between our Nation and less fortunate nations in the world today. I can see no better way to promote good will and peace than using our surplus grains and some of the ships that are in mothballs in giving food and medical care to the underprivileged of the world. I wholeheartedly support this movement and certainly encourage you to back it up.

Mr. and Mrs. Elmer Heide, who live at Canton, S. Dak., which is also the residence of my mother and my sister, have written:

We are especially interested in the Great White Fleet and sincerely hope it will become a reality soon. Certainly, a project like this is in harmony with the great commission of Jesus Christ. How can we make disciples if we neglect these crying needs?

Charles O'Neill, telephone manager of the city of Brookings, S. Dak., observed:

It is my sincere hope and prayer, that the idea of the White Fleet will very soon become a reality, as I am fully convinced that such a gesture by the American people and their Government can do nothing but good wherever applied. I surely would hope that there are enough intelligent men in the Congress to vote such a measure into existence. Direct humane relief is, as you have many times mentioned, our best defense against communistic aggression, especially in India, Greece and the other disease- and poverty-besieged countries.

A most enthusiastic response comes from H. R. Brekke of Madison, S. Dak., who said:

The idea of the White Fleet is the greatest idea of the century. In my opinion, it is a fulfillment of scripture of "Do unto others as you would have them do unto you."

One of my fellow World War II comrades who is also a resident of my hometown, Arthur Buehler, of Mitchell, wrote:

I wish to express my opinion about your supported idea of a new White Fleet. I, too, saw firsthand, as a soldier in Europe during

World War II, such hunger and misery as you have described. I want to say that I am wholeheartedly in favor of the proposed idea.

I believe that Mr. Fred Becker, a jeweler from Mobridge, S. Dak., has expressed the reaction of many Americans when he observed:

People have been wondering why the Government has not been doing this for many years. It is a good plan.

A treasured friend of mine from Yankton, S. Dak., Emma Meistrik, has told me that:

Most persons are in sympathy with your program of disposing of U.S. surpluses to needy persons overseas.

Another Yankton resident, an attorney and businessman, Mr. John E. Walsh, has written:

As a citizen, I believe this would be a marvelous program and one which would be extremely meritorious. You should have the support of all of your constituents. I trust that it will be successful.

Rev. Einar Michaelsen, pastor of the Congressional Church at Brentford, S. Dak., has raised a most interesting question with regard to the White Fleet proposal that deserves careful consideration. A portion of his letter follows:

I was pleased to read in the Aberdeen-American News that you also are advocating U.S. sponsorship of a White Fleet. You are to be congratulated for taking a forthright stand for the cause of peace; I want you to know that you have my most hearty support.

I wonder, however, if the fleet might be better handled under the sponsorship of the United Nations rather than flying the U.S. flag. Such a procedure, it seems to me, would eliminate any criticism of using the enterprise for propaganda reasons and also give other nations an opportunity to share their peculiar gifts with the rest of the world.

Many people are eager to play a personal part in implementing the mercy fleet idea as indicated by the following statement from Ernest C. Wirth of Vermillion, S. Dak.:

I am in full accord as to the mercy fleet and would welcome suggestions what to do to promote any more toward the realization of this hope. * * * Do write and state what I can do to help any further.

Mrs. Margaret McIntosh, the able public relations director of Yankton College, has written:

The Great White Fleet sounds like a most excellent idea. Would not the giving of surplus wheat for seed as well as for bread solve—or help solve—the surplus problem as we all hope it can be solved someday freeing the billions of dollars that the storage costs and, at the same time, demonstrating, as you say, our good will toward the hungry nations?

The J. C. Penney Co. manager, Harold Dufelmeier of Chamberlain, S. Dak., writes:

Your Washington Report dated July 25 has just arrived. I am one of the many folks back home who wish you great success in your attempt to establish a Great White Fleet.

Alec McDonald, an old friend from Wilmot, S. Dak., writes:

Your newsletter came today. The idea contained is new to me, but nonetheless

praiseworthy. What a great world it would be if we spent half as much for construction as we do for destruction.

Rev. Roger Grow, minister of the First Congregational Church of Beresford, S. Dak., writes:

I think that the White Fleet idea which is written up in the current Life magazine deserves the attention of the Congress. This seems to me to be a most wholesome idea, worth while—and the kind of thing that should meet with your approval.

My friend, Ivan Brewick, Mitchell insurance man, writes:

I was very much impressed with your newsletter about the Great White Fleet. When a person sees all of the sickness and suffering that goes on even in our land of plenty, and then hears all about the surpluses we have, it makes a person wonder if there isn't something that can be done to alleviate this misery and hunger in a lot of places.

A 16-year-old boy from Huron, S. Dak., Dennis Lyle, wrote:

I believe that if more ideas like the idea of the new White Fleet were forthcoming from the people of both Russia and the United States, our problems would be solved. I sincerely think that the new White Fleet would help us more overseas than some of our aid programs.

George Holbosen of Willow Lake, S. Dak., has presented his views in slogan form:

Let's feed with the fleet, rather than fight with the fleet.

Judge William M. Potts of Mobridge writes:

I am very much in favor of promoting the Great White Fleet. Not only will this enterprise accomplish a great deal of good for poor people of the world, but it will also make it impossible for other nations to criticize the motives of the United States.

Other South Dakotans who have written me, and their comments follow:

Thomas Rowlands, Aberdeen, S. Dak.:

I think this is the best ever.

Earl Buhler, Aberdeen, S. Dak.:

I just finished reading your recent report concerning the Great White Fleet. In short, I think it is a tremendous idea.

Dr. P. O. Dickinson, Aberdeen, S. Dak.:

Just a note to tell you that I think the Great White Fleet idea is one of the best to come before Congress in my memory.

Wilbur Tiohct, Meckling, S. Dak.:

I think your proposal is the thing; get the surplus grain we have into the mouths of the starving people of the world.

Clem Heiberger, Spencer, S. Dak.:

I am in favor of putting the White Fleet into service. In talking with Ewald Osterberg of Salem last evening, he voiced the opinion that it was a very good thing.

Truman D. Elder, Miller, S. Dak.:

Received your interesting newsletter, and think your White Fleet idea an excellent one, as it serves many purposes. * * * I served in the Southwest Pacific area in World War II, and, too, noticed many cases of starvation, where a lot more good could be done with kindness, understanding, and supplying of more material comfort than mere cold dollars could bring.

B. J. Buisker, Britton, S. Dak.:

The Great White Fleet is a great idea. Push it all you can.

Barney Van Hatten, Conde, S. Dak.:

I approve of this proposal 100 percent. That would do more good than all the guns and bombs we could send.

Esther C. Rieck, Waubay, S. Dak.:

I think the new White Fleet idea is a wonderful idea.

Frank Egan, Sioux Falls, S. Dak.:

I am in receipt of your last report sent out July 25, 1959, and I approve of all this good work you speak of, and are trying to get set up relative to the White Fleet. I think that if we could get this material and food surpluses direct to the people, without some smart guy cashing in on it as in most of our past attempts to get through to the common people. Anyway, GEORGE, I'm for any attempt it might be to get our surpluses into the hands of these poor people, as I noticed Sunday while in the country a lot of our stored corn is not in too good shape now; and if it is not moved before the winter sets in, won't be much good.

Mr. Speaker, there is one South Dakotan I would like to single out for special praise in connection with the Great White Fleet. I refer to Mr. August Kludt of Mount Vernon, S. Dak., who suggested a similar idea to me in a letter dated June 13, 1959. Mr. Kludt presented his suggestion a full 6 weeks before the article by Commander Manson appeared in the July 27 Life magazine. It indicates the vision and common sense thinking that characterizes the people who live close to the soil in the rural heartland of America. I include a portion of Mr. Kludt's June 13 letter at this point:

I have often thought how it would be if we would use one of our old aircraft carriers for this job. If such a ship were outfitted with a complete flour mill and large baking oven (which most already have) and put such a ship in a foreign harbor where there is much need for empty stomach and give them ready-baked fresh bread, I think we would hit the spot where it counts most.

A load of wheat does not help much in the raw because the poor cannot buy it, and the rich don't need it, besides it lays in foreign bins too long and is again used to make money for the rich. This should not be.

Our ships should supply this floating bake-shop, thus putting many men to work and moving our wheat to where it belongs, to the

hungry. I think this would cost less than paying a million dollars a day to keep our grain under lock and key from year to year.

I think there is too much howling about our surplus; it seems some think it is a curse instead of a blessing.

Under unanimous consent, Mr. Speaker, I include my newsletter of July 25, a regular report which I send to constituents who request it, at this point in the RECORD:

WASHINGTON REPORT

(By Congressman GEORGE MCGOVERN)

JULY 25, 1959.

DEAR FRIENDS: "The idea of organizing a new White Fleet grew out of things I witnessed at the close of World War II. Like thousands of U.S. servicemen, I saw diseased, destitute, and poverty-stricken peoples living on the Asiatic rimland and in parts of Europe and Africa. In some areas I saw people actually dying on the streets of starvation and disease. Such sights made deep and lasting impressions on me."

The author of the above observation is U.S. Navy Comdr. Frank Manson, 38-year-old World War II veteran now on duty with the Navy in London.

THE GREAT WHITE FLEET

He is the originator of a proposal which has been presented to the Congress by several Congressmen and Senators including myself. His idea is to take out of idle storage a few of America's warships, paint them white as a symbol of peace, load them with surplus grains, food, and medicine, and send them on a globe-circling mission of mercy to the disaster areas of the world.

Fifty-two years ago, President Theodore Roosevelt dramatized America's emergence as a world power by sending 16 of our battle-ships fully armed around the world. Commander Manson's proposed fleet would be for an entirely different purpose: To demonstrate to hungry, disease-ridden people that the American people want a world of peace and that we stand ready to help other nations achieve better standards of life.

Commander Manson's impressions of the impoverished areas of the globe calls to my mind the destitute people of southern Italy with whom I lived for a year as an American bomber pilot in World War II. This was my first experience with human starvation, untended sick people and grinding misery. It was during those days of war and tragedy that I first resolved to work for a happier and more peaceful world. Commander Manson speaks for every thoughtful American who wants his country to do everything humanly possible to build a world where peace can be maintained with honor and dignity. This is no easy task, but it is the most important task of mankind.

COMMUNIST ECONOMIC THREAT

No one can doubt that America is everywhere challenged by a ruthless Communist threat which is not only militarily strong but which has every intention of beating us in economic and ideological competition. Khrushchev has bluntly told American visitors to Russia: "We declare war on you in the field of economics."

Highly trained teams of Russian technicians of all kinds, skilled in foreign language and the culture of the countries to which they are sent, are fanning out from Moscow into the underdeveloped areas of the world. They are telling the people that for centuries the Western Powers have exploited them, that communism provides a formula for a better life.

THE CHALLENGE TO AMERICA

America dare not ignore this highly organized Communist challenge. Great masses of people are grasping in desperation for some instrument to break the bonds of hunger and misery. They are no longer content to suffer in silence.

The contest between the free world and the Communist bloc for the allegiance of these uncommitted masses of the world will doubtless be the most significant global struggle of the next century.

The Great White Fleet is one dramatic device that we can use to demonstrate both the good will and the technical prowess of the American people. Such a fleet would be supported by voluntary contributions from the American citizenry.

MERCY FLEET LESS COSTLY, MORE EFFECTIVE

The cost would be much smaller and the results much greater than many of the questionable aid programs in which we are now engaged. The White Fleet would include one of the Navy's idle hospital ships manned by doctors and nurses who could not only minister to the most seriously ill or wounded, but who could demonstrate modern medical techniques to native doctors.

Stocks of surplus food and clothing would be carried on another ship. Still another would be a floating technical school capable of teaching natives techniques for improving their standard of living. Once established, the fleet could add a ship carrying exhibits of American agriculture, industry, education, and culture.

Resolutions introduced by myself and other Congressmen call upon the President to put the White Fleet into service. I would appreciate learning your views on this proposal.

Your friend and Representative in Congress.

GEORGE MCGOVERN.

(If you know of persons who are not now receiving this regular newsletter and would like to be on our mailing list, please send me their names and addresses.)

SENATE

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1959

Rev. Wilson R. Lanpher, minister, First Church of the Nazarene, Washington, D.C., offered the following prayer:

Eternal God, our Heavenly Father, with gratitude and a deep sense of need we turn to Thee for Thy guidance and strength this day.

There are so many voices clamoring for our attention that oftentimes the still, small, inner voice is lost in the rush. We know from experience, our Father, that we cannot fulfill our duties at our best till first we seek Thy face.

We thank Thee for the responsibilities, as well as the privileges, of freemen.

Our lines have fallen in pleasant places, and we have a goodly heritage.

And now, Heavenly Father, we pray for these Senators, upon whom heavy burdens rest. We pray Thee also to bless their families, for they, too, serve their country, as they adjust to enforced absences and upset schedules.

We pause to thank Thee this day for the traveling mercies Thou hast given to the President of this body, our Vice President, and to his wife. And we thank Thee for Thy help in giving him insight, courage, and poise in his recent journey.

Our times are troubled, so we seek Thy peace.

Our minds are finite, so we seek Thy wisdom.

In the deepest sense, help all of us to be good stewards of Thine, as we serve our Nation, our fellow men, and our God. In the name of Christ our Lord. Amen.

THE JOURNAL

On request of Mr. JOHNSON of Texas, and by unanimous consent, the reading of the Journal of the proceedings of Thursday, August 6, 1959, was dispensed with.

MESSAGES FROM THE PRESIDENT

Messages in writing from the President of the United States submitting nominations were communicated to the Senate by Mr. Miller, one of his secretaries.